Case 5:15-cv-04872CILISTIDO ON TRISTING TO 8/28/15 Page 1 of 10

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

purpose of initiating the civil do	ocket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCT	IONS ON NEXT PAG.	E OF THIS F	ORM.)		
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS Christopher Christian				DEFENDANTS Lehigh University		
 (b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Northampton County (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) (c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Robert J. Haurin Nachmias Morris & Alt 20 Ash Street, Suite 200 Conshohocken, PA 19428 610-629-6640 				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Northampton C (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED. Attorneys (If Known)		
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in (One Box Only)	III. CIT		NCIPAL PARTIES (Pla	ace an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	 □ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party) □ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III) 		(For Diversity Cases Only) and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF Citizen of This State \boxtimes 1 \boxtimes 1 Incorporated or Principal Place \square 4 \square 4 of Business In This State			
2 U.S. Government Defendant				Citizen of Another State 2		
			0.000	oreign Country	3	□ 6 □ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	(Place an "X" in One Box Oi	nly)				
CONTRACT	то		I	ORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS 440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities Employment	PERSONAL INJ 365 Personal Injum Product Liabi 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutica Personal Injum Product Liabi 368 Asbestos Pers Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROD 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lend 380 Other Persona Property Dam Product Liabi 385 Property Dam Product Liabi PRISONER PETTI Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detaine 510 Motions to Visentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Conditi 560 Civil Detaine Conditions of	ry - ility	LABOR The state of Property 21 USC 881 The state of Property 21 USC 881	422 Appeal 28 USC 158 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS 820 Copyrights 830 Patent 840 Trademark 840 Trademark 861 HiA (1395ff) 862 Black Lung (923) 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) 864 SSID Title XVI 865 RSI (405(g))	□ 375 False Claims Act □ 400 State Reapportionment □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations □ 480 Consumer Credit □ 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange □ 890 Other Statutory Actions □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 895 Freedom of Information Act □ 896 Arbitration □ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision □ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
	moved from \(\subseteq 3 \) Rem	Confinement anded from ellate Court			sferred from [] 6 Multidis her District Litigation	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	29 U.S.C 621 et seq Brief description of caus	e:		Do not cite jurisdictional status		
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS IS UNDER RULE 23,	A CLASS ACTIO		DEMAND \$		if demanded in complaint:
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER	
DATE 08/26/2015		SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY O	F RECORD		
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY RECEIPT # AM	4OUNT	APPLYING JFP		JUDGE	МАС. ЈИ	DGE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar. Address of Plaintiff: 1561 Riegel Street, Hellertown, PA 18055 Address of Defendant: 428 Broadhead Avenue, Bethlehem, PA 18015 Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: 428 Broadhead Avenue, Bethlehem, PA 18015 (Use Reverse Side For Additional Space) Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation and any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock? (Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)) Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities? No YesD RELATED CASE, IF ANY: Case Number: Judge Date Terminated: Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions: 1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? 2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated Yes□ No 3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? Yes□ No 4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual? Vec -CIVIL: (Place / in ONE CATEGORY ONLY) A. Federal Question Cases: B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases: 1.

Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 1.

Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. D FELA 2. D Airplane Personal Injury 3. D Jones Act-Personal Injury 3.

Assault, Defamation 4. □ Antitrust 4. □ Marine Personal Injury 5. □ Patent 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Dabor-Management Relations 6. D Other Personal Injury (Please specify) 7. Civil Rights 7. D Products Liability 8. □ Habeas Corpus 8. Products Liability - Asbestos 9. D Securities Act(s) Cases 9. D All other Diversity Cases 10. □ Social Security Review Cases (Please specify) 11. D All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check Appropriate Category) I. Robert J. Haurin counsel of record do hereby certify: Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; □ Relief other than monetary damages is sought. DATE: 8/26/2015 65947 Attorney-at-I Attorney I.D.# NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38. I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above. 65947 DATE: 8/26/2015 Attorney I.D.# CIV. 609 (5/2012)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

assignment to appropriate calendar.	to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose
Address of Plaintiff: 1561 Riegel Street, Hellertown, PA 18055	
Address of Defendant: 428 Broadhead Avenue, Bethlehem, PA 18015	
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: 428 Broadhead Avenue, Bethlehem,	
(Use Reverse Side Fo	or Additional Space)
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation	on and any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock?
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1	(a)) Yes No
Ooes this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities? RELATED CASE, IF ANY:	Yes□ No W
Case Number: Judge	Date Terminated:
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:	
. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within on	e year previously terminated action in this court?
	Ves No.
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a pri action in this court?	or suit pending or within one year previously terminated
	Yes□ No 🗹
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earli	er numbered case pending or within one year previously
terminated action in this court?	Yes□ No M
Is this case a second or successive habon commo again.	inha and Challanda and Challanda
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil ri	
	Yes□ No ™
CIVIL: (Place V in one category only)	
A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases;
1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	1. □ Insurance Contract and Other Contracts
2. □ FELA	2. □ Airplane Personal Injury
3. Jones Act-Personal Injury	3. Assault, Defamation
4. □ Antitrust	4. □ Marine Personal Injury
5. □ Patent	5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury
6. Labor-Management Relations	6. □ Other Personal Injury (Please specify)
7. V Civil Rights	7. Products Liability
8. □ Habeas Corpus	8. Products Liability — Asbestos
9. Securities Act(s) Cases	
0. □ Social Security Review Cases	9. All other Diversity Cases
11. All other Federal Ouestion Cases	(Please specify)
(Please specify)	
ARBITRATION CEI	
, ROBERT J. Haurin , counsel of record do hereby ce	ertify:
Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge a 5150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs:	and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of
Relief other than monetary damages is sought.	
1/1/1 XV	(5047
DATE: 8/26/2015	65947
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if	Attorney I.D.# there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.
certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending except as noted above.	or within one year previously terminated action in this court
What All	
DATE: 8/26/2015 ////	65947
Attorney-at-Law Attorney-at-Law	Attorney I.D.#

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

Christopher Christian		CIVIL ACTION				
٧,						
Lehigh University	<u>:</u>	NO.				
plaintiff shall complete a Ca filing the complaint and serve side of this form.) In the e designation, that defendant s	se Management Track Desige a copy on all defendants. (Sevent that a defendant does whall, with its first appearance ties, a Case Management Tr	Reduction Plan of this court, counsel mation Form in all civil cases at the time See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the revenot agree with the plaintiff regarding se, submit to the clerk of court and serve tack Designation Form specifying the transpect.	e of erse said			
SELECT ONE OF THE FO	OLLOWING CASE MANA	AGEMENT TRACKS:				
(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255.						
(b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits.						
(c) Arbitration - Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2						
(d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos.						
		tial or intense management by dexplanation of special	()			
(f) Standard Management – Cases that do not fall into any one of the other tracks.						
8/26/2015	Robert J. Haurin	Plaintiff				
Date	Attorney-at-law	Attorney for				
610-629-6640	856-733-6614	rhaurin@nmapc.net				
Telephone	FAX Number	E-Mail Address				

(Civ. 660) 10/02

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CHRISTOPHER CHRISTIAN,

1561 Riegel Street

Hellertown, PA, 18055

PLAINTFF, : CIVIL ACTION NO.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

LEHIGH UNIVERSITY, 428 Broadhead Avenue

Bethlehem, PA 18015,

٧.

DEFENDANT.

COMPLAINT

Plaintiff, by and through his undersigned counsel, complains about Defendant as follows:

- 1. This action arises under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 ("ADEA"), 29 U.S.C. § 621 et. seq., and the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act ("PHRA"), 43 P.S. § 951 et. seq.
- 2. Plaintiff is Christopher Christian ("Plaintiff"). Plaintiff is an adult individual residing at the address listed in the caption. Plaintiff was born on August 2, 1954. At the time of his unlawful termination, Plaintiff was 59 years of age.
- 3. Defendant, Lehigh University ("Lehigh") is a private university operating in accordance with the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Lehigh's principal place of business is listed in the caption.
 - 4. Lehigh is an employer as that term is defined by the ADEA and PHRA.

- 5. The original jurisdiction of this Court is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because this matter involves a federal question and under the supplemental jurisdiction of the Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367 with regard to Plaintiff's state law claim.
- 6. Venue is appropriate in this District as the Defendant resides in this District and the acts about which Plaintiff complains occurred in this District.
- 7. All conditions precedent to this lawsuit have been fulfilled. Plaintiff timely file charges of discrimination with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission on or about August 1, 2014.
- 8. Plaintiff has exhausted all of his administrative remedies prior to bringing this action.
- 9. At all times relevant to the Complaint, Lehigh acted by and through its agents, servants, and employees, each of whom acted within the scope of their employment with Lehigh.
- 10. Plaintiff commenced employment with Lehigh in 1976 as Manager of Transportation. Thereafter, Plaintiff was promoted to Director of Transportation, Transit and Parking Services for Lehigh. In this latter capacity, Plaintiff was responsible for, among other things, student parking, bus services, the rental pool, fleet maintenance and fueling of Lehigh's fleet, related risk management services, operation of all parking lots, facilities, parking and vehicle registration, enforcement and event parking.
- 11. During Plaintiff's entire 37 year career at Lehigh, he performed his job duties in exemplary fashion and routinely received excellent job performance evaluations from his supervisors. Plaintiff also received annual pay raises and awards during his tenure with Lehigh. Most recently, in 2013, Plaintiff received a \$500.00 award from Lehigh for his outstanding efforts during a power outage at Lehigh.

- 12. In or about 2005, Lehigh hired Mark Ironside as the Executive Director of Business Services. In this capacity, Mr. Ironside was Plaintiff's direct supervisor. Mr. Ironside, in turn, reported to Margaret Plympton, Vice President of Finance and Administration.
- 13. Mr. Ironside is substantially younger than Plaintiff and had virtually no experience in transportation, transit and parking services in a university setting at the time of his hire.
- 14. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Mr. Ironside was aware of Plaintiff's age and routinely questioned Plaintiff about his future plans regarding his employment with Lehigh.
- 15. Following his appointment as Executive Director of Business Services, Mr. Ironside initiated a campaign to terminate older workers at Lehigh that were in his chain of command.
- 16. In furtherance of his campaign, Mr. Ironside undertook to discredit Plaintiff for the purpose of terminating his employment by, among other things, reprimanding Plaintiff for interactions with other constituents of Lehigh without first conducting any investigation into whether Plaintiff had committed any act for which a reprimand was warranted.
- 17. Mr. Ironside also continuously urged Plaintiff to convince an older worker who was employed by Lehigh as a mechanic to retire his position at Lehigh. The mechanic had over thirty (30) years of service with Lehigh and was an outstanding employee.
- 18. Mr. Ironside also made unwelcome comments to Plaintiff about his age during the period that Plaintiff reported to Mr. Ironside. For example, Mr. Ironside questioned Plaintiff several times about his plans for the future and whether he intended to remain employed by Lehigh or retire. These unwelcome comments occurred during meetings to discuss Plaintiff's performance evaluations in 2012 and 2013 and at other times.

- 19. Each time Plaintiff was questioned by Mr. Ironside about his future plans and whether he intended to retire, he advised Mr. Ironside that he intended to remain employed by Lehigh until he reached the age of 67 due to his financial situation.
- 20. Despite the fact that Plaintiff had previously advised Mr. Ironside on at least two (2) occasions that he intended to continue to work at Lehigh until age 67, Mr. Ironside asked Plaintiff whether he intended to remain employed or retire in January 2014. This statement was likewise made in connection with a meeting to discuss Plaintiff's job performance for 2013. Significantly, at no time during this meeting or the 2 prior meetings in 2012 and 2013 did Mr. Ironside comment negatively on the manner in which Plaintiff interacted with students, faculty, employees or other third parties.
- 21. In addition to making inquiries about Plaintiff's retirement plans, Mr. Ironside also made comments to Plaintiff and other subordinates that they were no longer doing things the "old way"; rather, his organization was going to do things his way.
- 22. Plaintiff's last 2 written performance evaluations for 2011 and 2012 that were completed by Mr. Ironside likewise contained no negative comments about the manner in which Plaintiff interacted with students, faculty, employees or other third parties. Instead, these performance evaluations were very complimentary of the way in which Plaintiff continued to perform his job at Lehigh.
- 23. Mr. Ironside did not complete a written performance evaluation for Plaintiff for 2013. It is believed and therefore averred that Mr. Ironside did not complete a written performance evaluation for Plaintiff in 2013 because he had already decided to terminate Plaintiff's employment because of his age.

- 24. On April 17, 2014, Mr. Ironside summarily terminated Plaintiff's employment without notice or warning. The reason given by Mr. Ironside for Plaintiff's termination was that "[w]e have lost confidence in your ability to meet the requirements of your position."
- 25. Following Plaintiff's unlawful termination, his job duties were assigned to individuals who were substantially younger than Plaintiff, were far less qualified than Plaintiff and had far less experience working in Parking and Transportation Services.
- 26. It is believed and therefore averred that the individuals who assumed Plaintiff's job responsibilities also had significantly less job experience in a university setting than Plaintiff.
- 27. Mr. Ironside terminated Plaintiff's employment because of his age, and the vague reason given by him for terminating Plaintiff was mere pretext to disguise his discriminatory animus towards older workers, in general, and Plaintiff, in particular.
- 28. On information and belief, Lehigh terminated the employment of another older worker in its Finance and Administrative division in or about November 2012.
- 29. It is believed and therefore averred that the older worker who was terminated in November 2012, was also advised that the reason for the termination was because Lehigh had lost confidence in her ability to do her job.
- 30. Plaintiff believes and therefore avers that this older worker was terminated because of her age.

COUNT I - ADEA

- 31. The allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 to 30 are incorporated by reference as if fully restated herein.
- 32. Plaintiff is in the class of persons protected from discrimination by the ADEA because he was 59 years old when he was terminated.

Case 5:15-cv-04872-JLS Document 1 Filed 08/28/15 Page 10 of 10

33. Lehigh terminated Plaintiff on account of his age in violation of the ADEA.

34. Plaintiff has been damaged by Lehigh's unlawful conduct.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment in his favor and against Lehigh on Count I of

his Complaint and that he be awarded back pay, front pay, liquidated damages, interest, costs and

attorney fees and all other relief provided by the ADEA and that the Court deems just and

appropriate.

COUNT II - PHRA

35. The allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 to 34 are incorporated by reference as if

fully restated herein.

36. Plaintiff is in the class of persons protected from discrimination by the PHRA in

that he was 59 years old when he was terminated.

37. Lehigh terminated Plaintiff because of his age in violation of the PHRA.

38. Plaintiff has been damaged by Lehigh's unlawful conduct.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment in his favor and against Lehigh on Count II

of his Complaint and that he be awarded back pay, front pay, compensatory damages, interest,

costs and attorney fees and all other relief provided by the PHRA and that the Court deems just

and appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

NACHMIAS MORRIS & ALT, P.C.

Dated: August 26, 2015

ROBERT J. HAURIN, ESOUIRE

Attorney ID No. 65947

20 Ash Street, Suite 200

Conshohocken, PA 19428

Attorney for Plaintiff

6